

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification has been amended to improve form and provide improved correlation with the drawings and claims. Claim 1 has been amended solely to improve the form of the claim and to incorporate limitations from claim 10, claim 10 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 1, 3-9, and 11 are pending and under consideration. Claim 11 has been amended to depend from claim 1 instead of cancelled claim 10. No new matter is presented in this Amendment.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

Claims 1 and 3-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lamkin et al. (U.S. Patent 7,178,106). Claim 10 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. The rejection of claim 10 is thus moot.

Lamkin does not disclose all the elements of claim 1. Table A.1.41 of Lamkin discloses an InterActual.ValidUOP(x) function, which determines whether a given user operation, such as "play", "forward", "stop", etc., is valid. Lamkin discloses that the primary purpose of this function is to determine a user operation (UOP) status, i.e, whether a given operation can be performed. Whether a user operation *can be* performed, however, is different from whether a user operation *has been* performed. The former question is hypothetical: if the user performs a given action, would that action be valid? The latter question is actual: has the user in fact performed a given action? The ValidUOP(x) function disclosed by Lamkin in Table A.1.41 addresses the first question, not the second. Lamkin thus does not disclose event registration to check whether the user performed the action.

In addition, the ValidUOP(x) function does not require that the user actually have performed an action, as suggested by the Examiner. It is possible to check whether a user *can* perform an action without requiring that the user actually perform the action. Indeed, Lamkin discloses just such a scenario at the bottom of Table A.1.41. Lamkin's example use of the ValidUOP(x) function calls the function to determine whether the "Time Play" function is permissible. If such an operation is possible, the statement "Time Play is permitted" is output, and if such an operation is not possible, the statement "Time Play is prohibited" is output. Lamkin does not disclose that the user actually have performed the Time Play operation.

Further, Lamkin discloses that during the interactive mode, certain functions are disabled (col. 19, lines 51-55). However, Lamkin does not disclose how the functions are disabled. In particular, Lamkin does not disclose that the markup document contains second event information to prohibit informing the AV decoder of the occurrence of the key input event. The extensive API documentation disclosed by Lamkin does not include such a second event. Since Lamkin does not disclose all the limitations of claim 1 either expressly or inherently, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claims 3-9 and 11 depend from claim 1. The rejection of claims 3-11 should be withdrawn for the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

CONCLUSION:

Entry of the amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 because the amendment does not require a new search and would at least place the application in better form for appeal.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 12/10/07

By: LG

Gregory L. Clinton
Registration No. 59,134

1400 Eye St., N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510